DECEMBER 1965

MONTHLY REVIEW

FIFTY CENTS

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 17

7

THE NECESSITY OF REVOLUTION

THE EDITORS

BRAZILIAN "INTERDEPENDENCE" AND IMPERIALIST INTEGRATION

RUY MAURO MARINI

Behind the Curtain of Silence KEITH BUCHANAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME SEVENTEEN NUMBER SEVEN DECEMBER 1965

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Necessity of Revolution 1
BRAZILIAN "INTERDEPENDENCE" AND IMPERIALIST INTEGRATION by Ruy Mauro Marini 10
VIETNAM: A WAR OF THE MASSES AND A SOCIALIST REVOLUTION by Adolfo Gilly 30
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 39
BOOKS: BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF SILENCE by Keith Buchanan 44

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright ©1965, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign. By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; elsewhere $11. By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

We record with sorrow the death of Professor Oskar Lange, the well known Polish economist and a friend for more than 30 years. Professor Lange suffered from tuberculosis of the thigh bone and had spent much time in hospitals in the last few years. Death, however, was caused by a liver infection. In spite of the handicap of ill health, he was an enormously productive scholar and writer, unquestionably one of the world's leading economists. His death at the relatively early age of 60 when he was in the midst of writing a major three-volume treatise on political economy is a grievous loss to the world socialist movement.

Press reports of the death in combat of the Peruvian guerrilla leader Luis F. de la Puente Uceda have unfortunately been confirmed by our associates in Buenos Aires. Dr. de la Puente was the author of the article "The Peruvian Revolution: Concepts and Perspectives" which appeared in last month's issue of MR. Our message from Buenos Aires says that a new guerrilla front has been opened in Peru, and readers of the dead leader's report on conditions in that country can hardly doubt that the struggle, now that it has been joined, will spread and intensify in the months and years ahead. Luis de la Puente Uceda thus takes his place as one of the martyred heroes of the Peruvian and Latin American Revolutions.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NECESSITY OF REVOLUTION

Last month in this space we discussed the Chinese perspective on the world, as authoritatively defined by Lin Piao in his article "Long Live the Victory of the People's War!" commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the victory over the Japanese invaders. The Chinese view, in briefest summary, is that the decisive struggle in the world today is between United States imperialism and the rising tide of revolution in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The revolutionary movement in the advanced capitalist countries has been "temporarily" held back; and the socialist countries, while they have a duty to support the liberation struggles of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, are not going to fight anyone unless they are attacked.* The Chinese believe that their victorious struggle against the Japanese invaders and then against their own reactionaries points the way to the other subjugated countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The war in Vietnam is the latest chapter in the story, and it will certainly be followed by many others. While Lin Piao does not attempt to forecast the future (beyond confidently predicting the defeat of imperialism), the impression is clearly conveyed that the Chinese expect the imperialist forces to be increasingly overextended and gradually worn down to the point of exhaustion; and the logical inference is that at some stage of the process the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries will be reactivated and will play its part in the final victory of the world revolution.

* This was stated without qualification by Mao Tse-tung in his most recent interview with Edgar Snow: "He asserted that China has no troops outside her own frontiers and has no intention of fighting anybody unless her own territory is attacked." *The New Republic,* February 27, 1965, p. 17.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It might be thought that this view of the world situation is totally different from that of the United States (in this context "United States" is of course merely shorthand for the corporate oligarchy and its political and military retainers). But this is not so; the truth, indeed, is that there is far-reaching agreement between the Chinese and United States views of the world. Washington naturally does not use the same terminology as Peking: it describes the basic struggle not as between imperialism and revolution but rather as between democracy and communist subversion. But the reality they are talking about is exactly the same, and Washington is every bit as convinced as Peking of the world-wide character and the historic significance of the conflict. The proof of this, if proof is needed, is that both the ideological life of the United States and the content of its world policy are overwhelmingly dominated by anti-communism.

Furthermore, we are convinced that there is another extremely important area of agreement between China and the United States—on the line-up of combatants in the decisive conflict of our time. As noted above, the Chinese are unlikely to fight unless attacked; and the same is obviously true of the Soviet Union.* The United States is fully aware of this and has no intention of attacking either China or the USSR. It follows logically that China and the United States are in tacit agreement that the combatants will be the United States and its local allies in the underdeveloped countries on the one side and the revolutionaries (communist subversives) on the other. Neither the advanced capitalist countries other than the United States nor the major socialist countries are likely to become involved in the fighting.

Many people of course do not agree with this, and there are even those whose who think that the real aim of American policy in Vietnam is to drag the United States into a war against China. This belief stems, at least in part, from the undoubted existence in this country of a war-with-China party which has played a role in every Far Eastern crisis since 1949 and on several

* In this context the Warsaw Pact countries must be treated as part of the USSR, just as, *mutatis mutandis,* the NATO countries have to be treated as part of the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occasions seemed on the verge of attaining its goal. This war-with-China party has always had its main strength in the right wing of the Republican Party and in the Navy and the Air Force; and it has always been opposed by the dominant corporate oligarchy represented by four successive Presidents, and by the Army. It probably reached its zenith and came closest to success under MacArthur's leadership in 1950-1951. In recent years, however, it has shown no signs of increasing strength, nor is there any reason to believe that the corporate oligarchy is more anxious now than it has been in the past to become embroiled in a major war with China.

In this connection it is important not to allow oneself to be misled by the ideological propaganda with which the American oligarchy surrounds and justifies its global policies. These policies cannot be sold to the American people under the straight—and accurate—label of counter-revolution; they have to be dressed up as defense of the "free world" against aggression. And for the aggression story to be taken seriously it has to be connected with centers of power formidable enough to constitute a real threat not only to weak underdeveloped countries but to the United States itself, a role which only the Soviet Union and China can fulfill. Hence the enemy against which the United States is supposed to be arming to the teeth is always identified, directly or indirectly, with the two major socialist powers. And every dispute or local war is presented as though it involved these powers and might at any time escalate into another world war.

In reality the oligarchy knows better. It knows that the Soviet Union and China are among the least aggressive countries of the world, which explains why it feels safe in installing military bases all around their periphery and committing its own counter-revolutionary aggressions right on their doorsteps. But it also knows that their fighting potential is very great indeed and that it would be self-defeating stupidity to force war upon them.

By now the truth of this statement as it relates to the Soviet Union is widely recognized. It is important that it should be equally widely recognized as it relates to China. We are not suggesting that China could inflict the same kind of damage on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States that the Soviet Union can—though this capability will certainly be acquired in the historically near future. The point is that right now China has the same kind of power to hurt the United States in Asia which the Soviet Union had in Europe even before the latter developed an atomic potential. If the United States had attacked the Soviet Union in the early postwar years, the Red Army could have fanned out and taken the entire continent hostage. The Chinese can do much the same in Asia now. The United States would either be driven out of Asia altogether or, perhaps even worse, get bogged down in an exhausting and fruitless war on many fronts against the world's largest army supported by local revolutionaries and guerrillas.

This is not what the American oligarchy wants. What it *does* want is to preserve the "free world" as a freely exploitable area in which giant American corporations can do business on their own terms. It would of course be delighted to be able to add Russia and China to this freely exploitable area, but it knows that this is an unrealistic goal, pursuit of which could only end in disaster. On the other hand, it is determined not to allow any more countries to escape from the corporate *Lebensraum*. This is what the war in Vietnam is about; it is what the occupation of Santo Domingo is about; it is what the parachute drop on Stanleyville was about; it is what Washington's entire global policy is about.

The great question which will dominate the last third of the twentieth century is thus whether the United States can prevent further escapes from the "free world." Washington and Peking are in complete agreement on this; where they differ is in the answer. For reasons which we have already analyzed, Peking says "no." What makes Washington think the answer is "yes"?

In the first place, American theorists and strategists reject the argument that past experience proves the invincibility of guerrilla warfare. To the guerrilla victories in China and Cuba and against the French in Vietnam and Algeria, they counterpose the guerrilla defeats in Greece, the Philippines, and Malaya. Guerrillas can be crushed, they maintain, by a more numerous army (it is often said that a 10-to-1 ratio is necessary),

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

superior technology, and a reasonably efficient local government. While underdeveloped countries as a rule cannot supply these ingredients of a successful anti-guerrilla policy, and even a country as advanced as France may find the price too high, the American oligarchy is confident that the mighty United States, with its unmatched command of technology and administrative know-how, can accomplish whatever it sets out to accomplish in this area. It regards the war in Vietnam as a crucial test case and has obviously decided to pour men and weapons into that country in whatever amounts may be required to keep the southern half in the "free world." Presumably the reasoning is that if the guerrillas of South Vietnam can be decisively defeated, potential guerrillas in other parts of the underdeveloped world will be deterred and the threat of spreading wars of national liberation, to which the Chinese attach so much importance, will be effectively scotched.

The American oligarchy's longer-range perspective is rarely defined in any clear way; perhaps it is even misleading to assume that it has one. It obviously thinks that international capitalism dominated by giant United States corporations is a viable socio-economic system; and it is deeply committed to the view that the troubles of the world are caused by revolutionaries rather than the other way round. It may be, therefore, that the oligarchy has no thoughts about the future beyond the simple-minded notion that everything will settle down once the communist subversives discover that guerrilla warfare can be contained and defeated.

A critique of this view, it seems to us, should not be focused primarily on its military aspect. It is certainly true that guerrilla wars have been defeated in the past, and it would be foolish to assume that this will never happen again. In addition, it may well be that the United States can establish and maintain a military presence at any given point in the underdeveloped world where it chooses to do so. Even if all this is granted, does it follow that the "free world" can be stabilized indefinitely for the greater benefit of giant American corporations? Or that the Chinese are necessarily wrong in predicting the ultimate defeat of imperialism?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course not. The real question is not whether a particular guerrilla movement can be checked, or American occupation of a given piece of territory can be carried out. The real question is whether the underlying problems which give rise to revolutionary movements and guerrilla wars can be solved within the framework of the system the United States is determined to defend. If they can be, then the policy of military counter-revolution makes sense as a means of keeping the system going in substantially its present form. But if these problems cannot be solved within the framework of the system, the ability to cope with guerrillas here or to occupy teritory there will be totally incapable of stemming the rising tide of revolution throughout the underdeveloped world. In that case, even the military situation will sooner or later be radically transformed, as a moment's reflection should be enough to establish. There are some 15 million inhabitants in South Vietnam. According to latest reports, the United States is planning to increase its troop strength there to at least a quarter of a million men. Let us assume, though it may well not be true, that this will be enough to ensure the continued military occupation of a large part of the country. The ratio of occupying forces to indigenous population is thus approximately 1 to 60. Applying the same ratio to the underdeveloped parts of the "free world," containing in all something like a billion and a half inhabitants, we find that an occupying force of no less than 25 million would be needed.

Absurd? Well, yes, in a way. Obviously the United States could never raise and support that kind of an occupying force. But as a statement of where present policies are leading it is not absurd at all. The plain truth is that the United States is taking on commitments which it cannot possibly fulfill. If it continues along this road, the result will be exactly what the Chinese foresee—eventual exhaustion and defeat.

This conclusion is, as we have already noted, subject to one proviso: if the unsolved problems which are fueling revolutionary movements in the underdeveloped countries can find solutions within the framework of the existing international system, there would be no reason to assume a need for a steadily mounting American military effort to hold the "free world" in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

line. So in the final analysis it all comes down to the nature and potentialities of the imperialist system itself. Will it or will it not permit the underlying problems to be solved?

Among these problems, undoubtedly the most urgent is the elementary one of feeding the world's rapidly increasing population. If this problem could be solved within the framework of the present system, there would be hope for a solution to others. If it cannot be solved, the system is doomed. And all indications are that it cannot. For one thing, the comforting notion that if worst comes to worst the United States can always make up from its own surpluses the food deficiencies of the underdeveloped countries, is rapidly losing whatever justification it may once have had. According to a Washington dispatch in the *New York Times* of November 8th:

> It has already been concluded, on the basis of careful studies, that in about 15 years, at the present rate of growth of population and farm output in the poor countries, the United States could not possibly produce enough food to make up the world's gap, even if it went to the maximum in production and was willing to spend the money.

The "world's gap" is a mere euphemism for increasingly widespread starvation, which is thus seen to be an absolute certainty if present population and food production trends continue. As for population, a drastic change in trend within the relevant time period is out of the question. And a drastic change in trend of food production pretty clearly depends on the very same revolutionary restructuring of society which American policy is designed to prevent. Here we can do no better, and need do no more, than quote at some length from a recent study of "Land Reform under the Alliance for Progress" by Ernest Feder,* adviser for land reforms and agricultural development with the Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development in Washington. After noting the bold promises of the Punta del Este Charter with respect to land reform, and stating what has by now become a commonplace, that "significant progress, at a rate and speed greatly exceeding all past performances, is imperative if one aims at improving the lot of the

* *Journal of Farm Economics,* August, 1965.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increasingly 'poorly fed, poorly clothed, and poorly housed' masses of the continent," Feder continues: "But as the Alliance goes into its fourth year, the question must be raised whether a 'peaceful revolution' such as the Charter envisages is within the realm of possibilities." He shows that though most Latin American countries have adopted land reform *legislation,* there has in fact been no land reform worthy of the name—only some resettlement and colonization of hitherto unoccupied lands which "in the final analysis . . . amounts to the creation of rural slums."

In the meantime, the economic and social problems in Latin American agriculture become progressively more serious. The number of underprivileged underemployed or unemployed farm people increases yearly. The task facing the various governments is growing at an alarming rate and will become unmanageable in 5 to 10 years using traditional national and international development policies. For example, in Brazil it was estimated that in 1950 there were about 7.4 million "underprivileged" farm people (producers on nonviable farm units, sharecroppers, and other permanent and temporary farm workers). Now the number has doubled, confronting the Brazilian government with a gigantic job which it has not yet begun to tackle systematically. The same trend is visible in other nations. In this connection, the extent of the "injustices" of which the Charter speaks had probably never been realistically appraised. Recent studies in seven countries by the Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development . . . indicate that the wealth or income gap between the small farmers or farm workers and the large farmers is considerably wider than generally suspected, and that it is largest in the best agricultural areas where monopolization of land and other resources by the largest estate owners is highest. According to one older report, landlords received incomes about 20-40 times larger than farm workers throughout Latin America on the average. But in the rich cacao plantation area of Bahia (Brazil), the average gross . . . of several large estate owners (a gross income derived only from the farms selected for interview and not from other farms owned nor including nonfarm incomes) was 100 times larger than the average annual cash wage income of a small but typical group of workers interviewed in 1963. The largest producer interviewed had an income 150 times larger. In addition the majority of the workers reported cash expenditures for living expenses exceeding their total cash incomes, testifying to a permanent debt condition.

In Guatemala, the average value of production from nine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

major farm products on large farms in one department in the Altiplano with hilly and eroded soils was 16 times larger than on family farms; however, in another department on the coast with flat and fertile land and large landholdings it was 41 times larger. In a township in the fertile valley of the Cauca (Colombia) the large estate owners were estimated to have an income 480 times larger than the small farmers.

The discrepancies in the distribution of *wealth* are still sharper than one can gather from the above figures. The bulk of the farm workers, even those who may cultivate land or plots ceded them by the landowners, have no assets of their own, except a few articles of clothing and cooking implements. Their incomes do not allow them to buy the most simple tools. It must be assumed that the injustices in the distribution of income and wealth are growing in intensity, particularly in countries with a significant rate of inflation. In contrast to a widely accepted opinion that inflation menaces the rich landowners because of increased social and political tensions, it seems to contribute, at least in the short run, to an increase in the power of the estate owning class to preserve the status quo.

After you have read this authoritative account of "progress" in Latin American agriculture under the Alliance for Progress, we suggest that you continue with the leading article in this month's issue which probes deeply into the meaning of the Brazilian coup of 1964. There you will learn how the Brazilian bourgeoisie, in ever closer relationship with the United States oligarchy, has chosen to tackle what Feder quite rightly calls the "gigantic job" confronting it. And if you have any lingering doubts about the absolute necessity of a thorough-going social revolution in that key Latin American country, they should be dispelled once and for all.

We would only add that Brazil is not only a key Latin American country. It is in many respects the most favored of all the "free world's" underdeveloped countries—in geographic position, natural resources, degree of industrialization. If Brazil cannot solve its problems without revolution, there is obviously even less chance for most of the others.

(November 10, 1965)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRAZILIAN "INTERDEPENDENCE" AND IMPERIALIST INTEGRATION

BY RUY MAURO MARINI

The state of inter-American relations since the United States and Brazil intervened in the Dominican Republic carries the threat of military domination of the entire continent. In 1961 this situation seemed improbable, and the United States was in no position to impose it, not even daring to give open support to an invasion of Cuba. In those days, the Brazilian position opposing intervention in the internal affairs of other countries had a decisive influence. And the present policies of the Brazilian military government play a similarly important role in the change which has taken place in inter-American relations.

Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to regard the new Brazilian policy as the only factor determining the inter-American situation, just as this situation cannot be taken as the simple result of the position of the United States Department of State. More exactly, both are explained by the internal and hemispheric changes which have occurred in the North American economy, and by the related changes in the Brazilian economy and its present position vis-à-vis the United States. This interrelation, which is part of the imperialist process of integration, must be analyzed in order to estimate correctly the present-day perspectives for inter-American policy.

Imperialist Integration

The process of capitalist accumulation in the North American economy and the accompanying growth of monopoly result in the ever-increasing concentration of ever-increasing wealth. If all the surplus thus obtained were invested in productive activities, crises perhaps even more violent than that of 1929

Ruy Mauro Marini is a Brazilian social scientist who formerly taught at the University of Brasilia and is now in exile in Mexico.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be inevitable. Post-war anti-inflationary policy in the United States has slowed down the rate of economic growth and limited the amount of surplus, without succeeding, however, in preventing it from growing beyond the possibilities for its absorption in productive investment. As a consequence, ever larger amounts have flowed into unproductive investment, principally in the arms industry and in sales promotion. The remainder which has not been absorbed in this way rushes out to the foreign market, making the export of capital one of the most characteristic features of contemporary capitalism.*

This capital naturally goes to the most profitable regions and sectors, and the return flow of profits further increases the amount of surplus, which in turn impels new foreign investments, thus recommencing the cycle on a higher level. In this way, the North American economic frontiers are continuously extended, the amalgamation of interests in the affected countries intensifies, and it becomes more and more necessary for the government in Washington to extend beyond its territorial limits the protection it provides for its nationals.

The most renowned Marxist theorist of the beginning of this century, Karl Kautsky, influenced by the revisionism of Bernstein and impressed by the process of monopoly concentration then under way, formulated his theory of "super-imperialism"; alongside the progressive concentration of capital in a gigantic world trust, one could expect a corresponding political centralization and a necessary and peaceful transition to socialism. Lenin, in his 1915 preface to Bukharin's *World Economy and Imperialism,* opposed Kautsky's theory, although without denying the integrationist tendency of world capitalism. What will happen, he warned, is that such a tendency will develop amidst contradictions and conflicts, thus giving impetus to the opposite tendency before reaching its culmination. The war of 1914 and the Russian Revolution, the Second World War and the phenomena which it engendered (the development of the socialist bloc and the movements of national liberation) proved Lenin to be right.

---

*See Paul Baran, "Crisis of Marxism?," MONTHLY REVIEW, October, 1958.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, it remains true that the expansion of world capitalism and the intensification of the monopolistic process continued to strengthen the integrationist tendency, as is clearly expressed today in the intensification of the export of capital. Another German Marxist, Ernst Talheimer, observing this during the 1920's, formulated his theory of *antagonistic cooperation*. At a time when North American domination seemed insuperable, Talheimer perceived that the very process of integration or cooperation would develop its internal contradictions. This was true above all with regard to the other industrialized countries which, as a result of the influx of North American investments, became in their turn centers of the export of capital and simultaneously extended their economic frontiers within the world-wide process of imperialist integration. The tensions which arise among these various integrationist centers cannot today, as they did in the past, reach open hostilities, and must remain within the framework of antagonistic cooperation. However, they have the effect of obstructing the process of integration, and they open fissures in the structure of the imperialist world, strongly favoring the forces bent on destroying the very bases of that structure: revolutionary movements in the underdeveloped countries.

Integration and Underdevelopment

It is not only at the level of relations among industrialized nations that the process of imperialist integration produces its own negation. This occurs also at the level of relations between the industrialized countries and the colonized peoples, and it is doubtless here that the determining factor leading to its self-defeat can be found. The export of capital to those nations in fact stimulates the development of their industrial sector, thus contributing to the creation of new situations of conflict, both internal and external, and furthering a crisis which alters the very conditions in which that industrialization develops.

Internally, industrialization in a backward nation is characterized by the sharpening of various types of social contradictions: those between the industrial and the latifundist-exporting groups; those between industry and domestic agriculture; those between the big landowners and the peasantry; and those be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween management and the working class, as well as the petty bourgeoisie. Thus, economic diversification is accompanied by increasing complexity and growing conflict. Not even foreign capital invested in the economy can escape these contradictions and present itself as a united bloc: the companies which invest in production for export (Anderson Clayton, United Fruit) do not have exactly the same interests as those which invest in industrial or agricultural production for the domestic market (automotive industry, household electrical appliances, canning industry); and they will react differently, for example, to a project of agrarian reform which would broaden the domestic market and create better work and wage conditions in the countryside.

The process of social diversification which results from industrialization is not necessarily synchronized with the rhythm of imperialist integration; this leads to the sharpening of the antagonism between the underdeveloped economy and the dominant economy. It can happen (as in Brazil, for example, between 1930 and 1950) that the national industrial sector grows more rapidly than the process of "denationalization" resulting from foreign investments. In addition to the disputes which arise in such a case between the two sectors in their struggle for the domestic market, their relations will worsen: on reaching a given level of industrialization, the growing need for capital imports will clash with the pressures from the foreign sector to export its profits.

The situation tends to become further aggravated because the reduction of the economic life span of fixed capital in the advanced economies, resulting from the incredibly rapid rate of technological innovation,* creates an urgent need to export their obsolete equipment to nations in the process of industrializing. However, the shortage of foreign exchange caused by the commercial and financial practices of these nations hampers their capacity to import. The contradiction can be overcome only by the introduction of such equipment into the underdeveloped countries in the form of the direct investment of capital. The

*See Ernest Mandel, "The Economics of Neo-Capitalism," in *The Socialist Register 1964,* Monthly Review Press, New York, 1964.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequence is the acceleration of the denationalization process, hence of integration, and a growing divergency between the technology of the industrializing nations and the employment needs of an exploding population. The manner in which they seek to overcome the foreign exchange bottleneck, since it creates labor problems, results in the sharpening of the internal social tensions, a most important factor in stimulating movements of national liberation.

The antagonistic cooperation between the bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped countries and imperialism is thus carried to the critical point where cooperation breaks down and a rift occurs. This is what happened in Brazil, and examining the mechanisms of that crisis as well as its consequences is a worthwhile effort.

Autonomous Capitalist Development?

The crisis in Brazil's export system, going back to the 1930's and clearly visible by the end of the Korean war, sharpened the contradictions of Brazilian society, showing the impossibility of continuing industrial development within the semi-colonial framework which existed until then. That impossibility has its roots in two structural limitations. The first is the crisis of foreign commerce, where there is a constant tendency for export prices to fall. This is accompanied by an incapacity on the part of the principal buying market (the United States) to absorb the increasing quantities of these products which the Brazilian economy must export in order to pay for the imports necessary for its industrialization. The second limitation is the system of landholding which strangles the supply of foodstuffs and raw materials required by industry and by population growth and urbanization. In addition to stimulating a rise of prices (which in turn stimulates popular protest movements), this system concentrates agricultural income in the hands of a small minority and hinders the expansion of the internal market for industrial products.*

Following the grave political crisis of 1954, which was brought on by that situation and was terminated by the suicide

*See my article "Contradicciones y conflictos en el Brasil contemporáneo," in *Foro Internacional,* No. 4, Mexico, 1964.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of President Vargas, the governments of Café Filho and Juscelino Kubitschek (products of a compromise among the conflicting dominant classes) attempted to find a formula which would allow them to survive the economic crisis without leading to a showdown between the opposing factions. The method chosen was to open the Brazilian economy to North American capital, for the purpose of easing the difficulties of the exchange sector. *Instrucción 113* issued by the Superintendency for Currency and Credit, now called the Banco Central, created the juridical framework for that policy, which reached its height with the *Plano de Metas* or Targets Plan of the Kubitschek government. In five years, about $2.5 billion in investments and credits were brought in, and once again industrial expansion got under way.

That expansion, however, began to show signs of exhaustion around 1960, as a result of falling prices and export volume and of the heavy exportation of profits, all of which plunged the country into a grave financial crisis. This was heightened also by the inflationary process, a symptom of the struggle which the industrial and banking bourgeoisie was waging against the rural-entrepreneural groups, as well as against the wage-earning classes. It must be remembered that Brazilian industrial expansion, based on the intensification of foreign investments and coinciding with the massive introduction of new technology, resulted in a perceptible rise in labor productivity and in the productive capacity of industry, and also in a corresponding increase in unemployment. Thus between 1950 and 1960, beside a population increase of 3.2 percent annually, an urban population increase of almost 6 percent annually, and industrial production increase of 9 percent annually, industrial employment showed an annual increment of no more than 2.8 percent.*

Once the palliative effects of the policy encouraging capital imports had ceased, the structural crisis in the Brazilian economy erupted into a true economic crisis, dragging the country into a

*Data cited by Celso Furtado, *Dialéctica del desarrollo,* Fondo del Cultura Económica, Mexico, 1965; pp. 18-19. Furtado does not hesitate, in an exaggerated simplification, to consider the unevenness between the rates of demographic urban growth and the rates of the creation of jobs in industry as the determining factor in the Brazilian political crisis in the last years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depression. In such a situation, it was inevitable that the social contradictions which had been evident in the years 1953-1954 should once again present themselves with much more force, above all those contradictions which moved the working and middle classes in the cities to fight for improvement in their living standard. Influenced by these groups and aware of the impossibility of maintaining industrial expansion within the narrow framework imposed by the latifundist-export sector and the groups of foreign monopolists, the bourgeoisie attempted to interrupt the cycle, breaking its agreement with those forces and imposing its own class policy. The governments of Janio Quadros in 1961 and—once parliamentary indecision was overcome in 1962—of Joao Goulart in 1963-1964, expressed this attempt.

Independent foreign policy and structural reforms were the directions in which these two governments moved, succeeding thereby in doubling the resistance of the dominant allied sectors. The first government attempted to create a degree of freedom in the international field in order to allow Brazil to diversify its markets for primary products and to supplement its credits, principally in the socialist bloc, and to open the way for the export of industrial products largely to Africa and Latin America. At the same time, the government aimed at reform of the agrarian structure in order to open new markets for domestic commerce and to increase the internal supply of raw materials and food products. These two policies came into conflict with the interests of the latifundist sector and of the monopolist exporting groups, for the most part North American. The adoption of measures which restricted national financing of foreign-owned enterprises and the remittance of profits abroad, as well as the outline of a policy of nationalization, generalized the conflict to all foreign sectors in the economy and made relations between the Brazilian and North American governments very tense.

For such a policy to be effective, the bourgeoisie needed the support of the politically decisive urban population. But, struggling with a financial crisis which reduced the rate of profits, the government paradoxically had to oppose the masses, and was forced to resist their wage demands. The attempt to apply deflationary policies in 1961 under Quadros and in 1963 under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Goulart (Three Year Plan, 1963-1965) encountered vigorous popular resistance; and the bourgeoisie, for political reasons, could not impose these measures by force. Entrusting to Goulart the task of containing the demands of the masses, the bourgeoisie tried to exploit the inflationary process for its own benefit, with the purpose of sustaining its margin of profits, all of which succeeded in speeding up the whole process. The workers' demands were radicalized through strikes growing in frequency and scope, and the middle class panicked before the concrete threat of the proletariat.

The agitation provoked by the threat of agrarian reform, and the resistance of the foreign industrial sector to nationalization measures, limited bourgeois support of Goulart more and more. When the anti-government campaign was intensified, on the pretext of fighting communist subversion, the middle class, disoriented by the economic crisis, was divided, joining the ranks of reaction in larger and larger numbers. Impressed by the cry of anti-communism and by the radicalization of the masses, and feeling that, with the failure of the Three Year Plan, Goulart no longer offered guarantees against a popular uprising, the bourgeoisie began to retreat. When the agitation reached the military sector, with the March 1964 rebellion of the sailors, it became clear that the government's authority was shaky. In an audacious move, the military group took over, without firing a shot.

Integrated Development

The conflicts brought on by industrialization within the framework of an imperialist system led Brazilian society to choose a solution by force, thus sealing the existing antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working class. At the same time, the use of force marked the definitive adherence of the Brazilian bourgeoisie to the policy of imperialist integration. Using repression by the military and police to stifle popular movements, and coercion to keep refractory middle-class groups in line, the new regime created the right climate to carry out this policy without the inconvenience of an opposition.

It is in this perspective that we must understand the "Program of Economic Action" which was worked out by the ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ambassador to Washington and present Minister of the Plan, Roberto Campos, and adopted by the government of Castelo Branco for the years 1965-1966. Its objective is twofold: to halt and reverse the decline in the growth of gross national product, aiming at a growth rate of 6 percent in the two years under consideration, and to arrest the general rise of prices, reducing the rate of increase from the level of 92.4 percent in 1964, to 25 percent in 1965, and 10 percent in 1966. The Program also proposes to reach "secondary objectives," among them to bring the balance of payments into equilibrium, to redistribute income (functionally and regionally), and also to "democratize" capital. In addition to the classical instruments of economic policy—tax, wage, and credit policies, tariff manipulations, control of government expenditures—the government's action is based on certain structural measures, principally agrarian reform and the reorganization of the internal capital market.

From the point of view of our analysis, the most important aspect is the attitude of the Brazilian government toward foreign capital. In a study published last March, the National Confederation of Industry (CNI) considered that the Program of Economic Action is distinguished from the previous programs "by the strategic part which foreign capital plays and by the high hopes with regard to its profits." After recalling that the Program anticipates an actual decline in the national rate of saving, the CNI statement underlines: "The diminution of the national rate of saving . . . will leave private domestic investment much diminished, constituting about one half of the foreseen influx of foreign capital."

Other government policies work in the same direction. According to the CNI itself, lending agencies reduced their activity sharply in 1964, increasing private credit by 84.2 percent and government credit by little more than 50 percent, in face of a rate of inflation greater than the 92 percent of the previous year. At the same time that national credit is tightened, the government, in its Program of Action, proposes to "offer private domestic investors access to foreign credit on the same conditions as the foreign enterprises operating in the country,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through guarantees by Brazilian financial organs or by participation of government funds in which foreign capital shares. Proceeding in this manner, the alliance of the national bourgeoisie with foreign capital, an alliance which began with the *Instrucción 113* in 1955, is solidified.

Meanwhile, industry is obliged to seek to reduce its costs of production through technological renovation which then tends to reduce employment. It is natural that the alliance with foreign groups, which always have machinery to dispose of because of the more rapid rate of renovation in their own countries, is the easiest way of promoting this technological renovation. And if this method fails and bankruptcy results, the effect is to facilitate even more the concentration of Brazilian capital *in the hands of foreign groups, the only strong sector of the* economy during this period of depression. The recent example of the bankruptcy of one of the largest metallurgical industries of the country, the Companhia de Mineraçao Geral of the powerful Jaffet group, and its purchase by a consortium formed by Bethlehem Steel, the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Standard Oil, illustrates this case well.

The Doctrine of Interdependence

This economic policy has its counterpart in the foreign policy of the Brazilian military regime, very different from the so-called "independent foreign policy" of the Quadros and Goulart governments, which was based on the principles of self-determination and non-intervention. Immediately after the 1964 coup, when he assumed the direction of the Ministry of Foreign Relations, the present Chancellor Vasco Leitao da Cunha rejected the idea of an independent foreign policy, invoking geopolitical reasons and asserting the desirability of having Brazil tightly bound to the Western world, particularly to the United States; he declared that the basic concept of Brazilian policy is that of *continental interdependence*. Thus, he adopted a doctrine which originated in the Escola Superior de Guerra headed by General Golberi do Couto e Silva, graduate of the United States training school at Fort Benning, Georgia, and chief of the National Information Service (SNI), an organiza-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion which, with its two thousand agents spread across the continent, was already being compared to a miniature CIA.

This doctrine, called the doctrine of the *barganha leal* or loyal bargain, was expounded by Do Couto e Silva in his book *Aspectos geopoliticos do Brasil* published in 1957, and was part of the theory that, because of its geographic position, Brazil cannot escape North American influence. In such a situation, he said, no alternative remains but to "consciously accept the mission of associating ourselves with the policy of the United States in the South Atlantic." The counterpart of this "conscious choice" would be the recognition by the United States that "the quasi-monopoly of rule in that area should be exercised by Brazil exclusively." The expression "quasi-monopoly" results from the impossibility of denying the designs which the Argentine bourgeoisie is also harboring in this sphere.

Two official pronouncements this year marked the adoption of this doctrine: the declaration which Chancellor Leitao da Cunha made on the 19th of May, in Rio de Janeiro, when he greeted his Ecuadorean colleague Gonsalo Escudero, and the speech which Marshal Castelo Branco made several days later in the city of Teresina (state of Piauí).

Greeting the Ecuadorean Chancellor, Leitao da Cunha alluded to "a concept inherent in the nature of the inter-American alliance, that of the interdependence of all the nations of the hemisphere in questions of international policy." "The rigid, orthodox conception of national sovereignty," he emphasized, "was formulated in an epoch when the nations did not consider the obligation to cooperate among themselves in the search for common goals as part of their responsibilities." The Brazilian Chancellor even praised "the support of the multilateral apparatus in the defense of the most American of political institutions: representative democracy." And he elaborated: "Few will doubt that the mechanisms established in the Charter of the Organization of American States against open aggression or attacks, are entirely inadequate in the new situation generated by the subversion which transcends national boundaries."

Speaking to the same point in his speech of May 28, Marshal Castelo Branco referred to the Dominican crisis as an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act of internal aggression against the continent. After proclaiming the necessity for replacing the concept of physical or geographical frontiers with that of *ideological frontiers,* the President-Marshal declared that, in accordance with the present Brazilian conception of national security, this is not limited to the physical frontiers of Brazil, but extends to the ideological frontiers of the Western world.

In line with this kind of thinking is the discussion of possible military intervention in Uruguay and Bolivia, as well as the determined support by the Brazilian government of the intervention of the United States in Santo Domingo. The applause from Brasilia for the North American decision to channel part of its military aid for Latin America through the OAS is also a consequence of that position, and is joined to the demand that the so-called "additional protocol" be reactivated, linking military to economic aid. Another consequence is the thesis of the military integration of the continent, giving shape to Brazilian insistence on the creation of a permanent inter-American army. This position is linked with the "silent pact" of joint action which the Ministers of War of Argentina and Brazil concluded last August in Rio de Janeiro.

For many, what is involved is simply a return to the Brazilian policy of submission to Washington (which was the rule in the period preceding Quadros), and the definitive conversion of Brazil into a colony of the United States. This is not correct. What we have, in reality, is the evolution of the Brazilian bourgeoisie toward the conscious acceptance of its integration with North American imperialism, an evolution resulting from the very logic of the economic and political dynamics of Brazil, and having grave consequences for Latin America.

Latin American Integration

In its internal and foreign policy, the Brazilian military government has taken hardly any steps to accelerate the integration of the Brazilian into the North American economy: rather, it has expressed the intention of becoming the center from which imperialist expansion in Latin America will radiate. In this, the present Brazilian foreign policy distinguishes itself from that of the past, as well as from that which is today fol-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowed in countries like Venezuela, Peru, Panama, and Guatemala. It is not a question of passively accepting North American power (although the actual correlation of forces often leads to that result), but rather of collaborating actively with imperialist expansion, assuming in this expansion the position of a key nation.

This aim is not derived solely from a desire for political leadership on the part of Brazil, but is due principally to the economic problems which the Brazilian bourgeoisie faces as a consequence of its option in favor of integrated development. The full re-establishment of its alliance with the ancient oligarchical exporting classes, sealed by the coup of 1964, left the bourgeoisie incapable of breaking the limitations which the agrarian structure imposes on the Brazilian domestic market. Even the project for agrarian reform adopted by the Castelo Branco government allows no other method of altering this structure than by the progressive long-term extension of capitalism to the countryside. But it should be noted that the present economic recession hinders the investment of capital in the countryside, and the narrow political base of the government does not allow it to ignore the support of the latifundists; both of these factors constitute an effective obstacle to the carrying out of agrarian reform.

On the other hand, by choosing to become integrated with imperialism and by placing its hopes for reactivating economic expansion on the influx of foreign capital, the Brazilian bourgeoisie has in effect agreed to intensify the process of industrial, technological modernization. This works in the interests of United States industry which finds it advantageous to build an integrated industrial establishment abroad, in order to dispose of the equipment which rapid technological evolution renders obsolete.* But the bourgeoisie must accept the consequences: in a country of rapid population growth, where a million men are

*Speaking in the Congress of the United States on the economic integration of Latin America, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Jack H. Vaughn, recognized that the resulting industrialization will cause the traditional markets for certain North American products to disappear, and he further underlined: "Likewise, Latin America will offer a more promising market for the more sophisticated products of North American industry." (*El Dia,* Mexico, September 11, 1965.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thrown into the job market each year, the installation of a relatively modern industry creates grave labor problems, principally unemployment.

Thus, because of its policy of reinforcing its alliance with the latifundists, and its policy of integration with imperialism, the Brazilian bourgeoisie cannot count on sufficient growth in the domestic market to absorb the increase in production resulting from technological modernization. There remains no alternative but to attempt foreign expansion, and it therefore becomes necessary to guarantee foreign markets for its products. The low production costs which the present wage policy and industrial modernization tend to create, point in the same direction: export. This explains the recent move of the Castelo Branco regime in favor of creating a Latin American Common Market under the aegis of Brazil.

This is not a new idea. The independent foreign policy of Quadros and Goulart also sought conditions favorable to an expansion of Brazilian commerce in Africa and Latin America. The difference is in the fact that then Brazil took on the position of "free lancer" in the world market, trusting that, through internal structural reform, the limitations to the growth of a domestic Brazilian market would not be long in disappearing. Export thus seemed a provisional solution, tending to furnish the bourgeois policy of reform with enough room to grow. At present, on the contrary, the bourgeoisie is concerned with counteracting the inadequacy of the domestic market through the extensive incorporation of already existing markets, as for example that of Uruguay. Export thus ceases to be a provisional solution, aiding and abetting reformist policies, and is converted into the alternative to these same structural reforms.

There still remains one question: How far will an industry without sufficient markets drive Brazil, in the short run, to expand its armaments production? To date, this is not clear. In any case, in view of the government's need for an armaments industry capable of sustaining its expansionist policy, such a development may well be feared. This fear is further justified by the great share of the 1964-1965 federal budget allotted to the military, as well as by the recent contract signed in Washington

(continued on page 26)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

CHRISTMAS

Prices Slash

All Cloth Bound Books

12. PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray. The relationship of patriotism to capitalism, socialism, communism, and civil liberties.
LIST $4.00 ..... ONLY $1.00

13. BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders. Preface by Bertrand Russell. The book attacked by Huie in his HIROSHIMA PILOT.
LIST $4.00 ..... BARGAIN $1.00

14. THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran. A MUST book for every serious socialist.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

15. THE MANIFESTO. Contains a reproduction, from hand-set type, of THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO; also PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM by Engels, and THE MANIFESTO AFTER 100 YEARS by Huberman and Sweezy.
LIST $2.50 ..... SPECIAL $1.50

16. REVOLUTION IN SEATTLE by Harvey O'Connor. A stirring account of great deeds by great men narrated by a participant.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

17. MARXISM OF OUR TIME by Gilles Martinet. The editor of FRANCE-OBSERVATEUR takes a critical look at the theories of Marxism with a view to determining their validity in the world today.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $2.00

18. WE, THE PEOPLE by Leo Huberman. A famous history of the U.S. with 58 illustrations by Thomas Hart Benton.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

19. THE ORDEAL OF BRITISH GUIANA by Philip Reno. Background picture.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $2.00

21. THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX by Stanley Moore. Traces back to Marx some of the issues currently dividing the USSR and China.
LIST $2.25 ..... SPECIAL $1.25

22. THE SOCIALIST REGISTER, 1964, edited by Miliband and Saville. Deutscher's article on "Maoism" is alone worth the cost.
LIST $6.00 ..... SPECIAL $4.00

23. CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox. Indispensable reference for students of race relations.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

24. THE UNITED STATES, CUBA AND CASTRO by William Appleman Williams. A must for anyone interested in Cuba.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $2.00

25. WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harvey O'Connor. A survey of the world industry.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $4.50

26. WELLINGTON ROAD by Margaret Lassell. Journal of six months with an English working class family on relief.
LIST $3.75 ..... SPECIAL $1.00

27. WASTE by Danilo Dolci. "Probes the depths of Sicilian misery and despair with telling effect."—Saturday Review
LIST $6.75 ..... SPECIAL $4.50

28. FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray. The arguments of both sides explained and evaluated. Contains the complete texts of the most crucial documents.
LIST $8.50 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

29. CHINA TRIUMPHS by Julio Alvarez del Vayo. See box below.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

20. CHINA SPECIAL

Three books that should be in every socialist library:

1. CHINA TRIUMPHS by Julio Alvarez del Vayo. Eye-witness account by the former Foreign Minister of the Republican government of Spain. List price $5.00.

2. NOTES FROM CHINA by Joan Robinson. Two essays on "The Chinese Point of View" and "The People's Communes" by the famous English economist who visited China three times. Paperback, list price 75c.

3. THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley. The history of the Chinese Revolution graphically narrated via the biography of Chu Teh. List price $6.75.

LIST $12.50 ..... SPECIAL COMBINATION PRICE FOR ALL 3 BOOKS $7.00

All orders must be postmarked not later than Dec

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OOK SALE

l up to 75%

For Special Offer on Paperbacks See Page 48

30. THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL by Rosa Luxemburg. Reprint of a classic.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

31. THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN CUBA by J. P. Morray. Shows how the development of the Cuban Revolution after January, 1959, changed the ideology and character of the regime to one of socialism and Marxism-Leninism.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $2.00

32. CAPITALISM AS A SYSTEM by Oliver C. Cox. The evolution of capitalism from its earliest beginnings.
LIST $6.50 ..... SPECIAL $4.00

33. MARXISM AND MORAL CONCEPTS by William Ash. Marxist ideas in ethics and morality.
LIST $3.50 ..... SPECIAL $2.50

34. THE MAN AT THE DOOR WITH THE GUN by Cedric Belfrage. "This is a great book"—Han Suyin.
LIST $4.50 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

35. REVIEW I by Weisinger et al. MR's cultural supplement. "Impressively high standard."—Tribune (London)
LIST $3.00 ..... HALF PRICE $1.50

36. IN PLACE OF FEAR by Aneurin Bevan. "Elucidation by an authentic voice of British socialism."—Library Journal.
LIST $4.50 ..... SPECIAL $2.50

37. SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY by Deana Levin. "It tells much more about Russia, its hardships and achievements, than any book I have read for a long time."—Jennie Lee
LIST $4.00 ..... SPECIAL $2.25

38. THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE: GERMANY FROM HITLER TO ADENAUER by Heinz Abosch. Relates the development of German society to the economic, social, and moral problems of our time.
LIST $5.00 ..... HALF PRICE $2.50

39. WILLIAM MORRIS: THE MAN AND THE MYTH by R. Page Arnot. A defense of Morris as a revolutionary socialist against the "canonization" of him by the Establishment as a wooly-minded reformer.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $2.50

40. WHITHER LATIN AMERICA? by Fuentes et al. Essays on Latin American economic, political and social scene.
LIST $3.00 ..... SPECIAL $2.00

41. REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHER POEMS by John Beecher. Collector's item. Beautiful Xmas gift.
LIST $3.00 ..... HALF PRICE $1.50

Suggested order form below. Please be sure to enclose correct payment with name and address printed plainly.

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10014

Enclosed find $..... Please rush to me, postage paid, the selections circled below.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

31. Titles go up to list price again on January 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Brazilian Minister of the Navy for a program of warship construction in Brazilian shipyards.*

What is forecast, then, is an imperialist expansion on the part of Brazil in Latin America, which amounts to the creation of a sub-imperialism or to the extension of North American imperialism. It is in the perspective of this economic and military integration of Latin America, initiated by North American imperialism and supported by Brazil, that we must consider the subsequent evolution of inter-American policy. But it is also from this point of view that we shall have to estimate the prospects of the revolutionary process in Brazil, and, in the last analysis, in Latin America.

Conclusion

The first conclusion from the foregoing is that imperialist integration of Latin America, in the phase initiated by the Brazilian military coup, will be unable to function except in the framework of antagonistic cooperation. The antagonism will be more accentuated where the national bourgeoisie is powerful, as in Argentina and Brazil,** but cooperation or collaboration will be more and more the rule governing the relations of these bourgeoisies among themselves and with the United States. The power of North American and Brazilian influence will necessitate this cooperation. But more than anything else, collaboration will be necessary to the dominant classes of the hemisphere in order

*This article was already written when *Prensa Latina* published passages from an interview with the President of the Latin American Confederation of Christian Trade Unionists, Emilio Maspero, in the Chilean magazine *Ercilla*. In this interview Maspero denounces the formation of a powerful North American industrial-military complex in Brazil. He declared that the plan "includes the investment of North American funds to install factories for heavy armaments, equipment and special foods for the troops," and that in Rio de Janeiro "it is rumored that the food industry has already made an agreement to produce on Brazilian soil the concentrates used by North American troops in the field, as the first step in an industrial-military integration which would reach, in the future, the production of vital parts for nuclear submarines." (*Prensa Latina,* Mexico, September 10, 1965.)

**This is indicated already in the protest voiced by the Argentine newspaper *Clarín* (August 11, 1965) against a declaration by Senator Fulbright supporting a Latin American Common Market directed by Brazil. This, according to *Clarín,* is a resurrection of "the old strategy of the key country."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to block the revolutionary rising of the masses, itself speeded by the growth of imperialist integration.

In this particular, the Brazilian case is typical. The military coup of 1964—marking the bourgeoisie's rupture with the policy which it practiced since its accession to power (that is to say, since the revolution of 1930)—opens a new phase in the process of class struggle. Although many social sectors, principally the middle class, may seek to re-establish between the bourgeoisie and the masses the kind of political dialogue which existed before 1964, class relations are presently characterized by a schism, on one side of which is the dominant alliance (the bourgeoisie, the foreign entrepreneurs, and the large landowners), and on the other the rural and urban working class. The petty bourgeoisie suffers the effect of the schism contradictorily, taking positions which go from radicalism on the extreme Left to neo-fascism on the extreme Right, and including the conciliatory attempts of a center group which responds to the cry of "re-democratization" raised by the Brazilian Communist Party.

It is inevitable that the schism in Brazilian class relations will lead sooner or later to open civil war. It could be argued that imperialist integration could lead, in the long run, to greater economic prosperity, eliminating the revolutionary factors which today agitate Brazilian life. This is indeed a possibility. However, its realization would depend on whether the integration is accomplished before the process of class struggle is irreparably worsened. And this is what seems highly improbable.

In fact, imperialist expansion on the part of the Brazilian bourgeoisie has to base itself on a greater exploitation of the national working masses. This is because of the need to maintain production on an internationally competitive level, a need which necessitates low wages and readily available manpower, that is to say a high rate of unemployment. A further reason is the fact that greater exploitation develops simultaneously with an increase in the penetration of North American capital, thus necessitating the extraction of a super-profit from the working class. This intensification of capitalist exploitation of the Bra-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zilian people is cause enough to exacerbate the class struggle and endanger the position of the bourgeoisie.

The precise moment in which this will happen does not depend so much on the intensification of capitalist exploitation as on the time needed by the Brazilian masses to learn the lesson of 1964, and on the capacity of the Left to guide them in that process of maturation. In Guatemala, which ten years ago had a similar experience, much time and many failures were necessary before the beginning of what seems to be the decisive phase of the civil war. In Brazil, the revolutionary immaturity of the forces on the Left is a factor capable of delaying that moment, and perhaps even favoring the neo-fascist adventures of the Right. However, we must reckon with the rapid rhythm which the revolutionary process in Latin America is today assuming, and with the repercussions of Brazilian imperialist expansion, which may accelerate considerably the reorganization of the Brazilian Left.

This is, without a doubt, a fundamental point. That is to say, we must not consider the case of Brazil as isolated, but rather take into account the global repercussions of imperialist integration. The inability of the majority of South American countries to meet the competition of Brazilian industrial production will increase the misery of their peoples, at the same time submitting them to the humiliation of a new imperialism—aggressive and overpowering, like all imperialisms, but more so in this case—which they will not long be able to bear. In their struggle against Brazilian imperialist expansion, these people will not be long in joining the resistance of the mass of Brazilian workers and peasants.

An important consequence of the military coup of 1964 is the end of the feeling of singularity and exclusivism in relation to the rest of Latin America, with which the Brazilian people were accustomed to see their political process. Of all the great events which have come to pass in the continent, only the Cuban Revolution, because of its exceptional importance, broke through the barrier which had been created around the Brazilian people. With the 1964 coup, that situation changed abruptly, thanks above all to the pro-United States position of the military government. At once, the great majority of Brazilians concluded that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they had been mistaken about the possibilities of their country, and that Brazil would now continue being a United States colony, of the same order as Panama, for example, or Puerto Rico. To the extent to which they realize the true nature of present relations between the dominant classes in Brazil and United States imperialism (clearly very different from those maintained with Panama or Puerto Rico), the sentiment of Latin American solidarity which the coup aroused in Brazil can only deepen.

The union of the popular movements of Brazil and the rest of Latin America, that is to say the internationalization of the Latin American revolution, is thus the counterpart to the process of imperialist integration, inaugurated in its new phase by the Brazilian military coup. However, it is not the only one. The fact that the advance of that integration tends increasingly to strain relations between the national bourgeoisie and the working class, as in the example of Brazil, allows us to foresee that the framework of that revolution, in addition to being popular, will also be socialist.

SPECIAL CHRISTMAS OFFER

Four MR PRESS Books

Newly published and available at prepublication prices until Christmas. Ideal gifts. Order now and avoid delays. Be sure to enclose payment with your order.

The Timely Rain: Travels in New Tibet
by Stuart and Roma Gelder
(with black-and-white and color photos)
List price: $8.95 Prepublication price: $.600

Studies in a Dying Colonialism by Frantz Fanon
List price: $4.95 Prepublication price: $3.50

A New World in the Making by Danilo Dolci
List price: $7.50 Prepublication price: $5.00
In combination with **Waste** by the same author: Only $9.00

The Socialist Register, 1965
edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville
List price: $6.00 Prepublication price: $4.00
Set of 1964 and 1965 volumes: Only $8.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIETNAM: A WAR OF THE MASSES AND A SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

BY ADOLFO GILLY

"Our people never leave a field without a fight. . . . Do not ask us to flee like frightened deer without staging a battle. I shall never ask my people to do such a thing. Not until the jungles die and the mountains crumble and the heavens fall on us. Never! Never! Never!" That is how the war in Vietnam started, when old Pho Muc Gia, chief of the small Kor tribe, consisting of not more than 4,700 members, refused to follow the "line" which demanded respect for the peace established by the Geneva Agreements while the Diem dictatorship was butchering his tribe and the rest of the population of South Vietnam. The ninety-year-old man also pointedly told the communist cadre who was bringing him the "line": "Some time ago you were real warriors. We fought together like a single body. Now we see that you do not belong any longer to the underground. If you did you would back us and you would not ask us to flee."

That was in 1959. The cadre who a few years later told this story to the Australian journalist Wilfred Burchett was the same man who tried to influence the old tribal chief. The arguments of the old man were more powerful and convincing, especially for the Vietminh veteran who had fought against the French and who was now in charge of bringing the line of "coexistence" to the tribesmen. But the tribesmen knew nothing of the Geneva Agreements—and they couldn't have read them if they had known about them. All they knew was that the land was theirs and that one must never flee without a fight. They went ahead on their own: they ambushed the local garrison, killing everyone

---

Adolfo Gilly, a frequent contributor to MR, is the author of *Inside the Cuban Revolution* (MR, October, 1964) and *The Guerrilla Movement in Guatemala* (MR, May and June, 1965). The translation from the Spanish is by S. A. Aponte.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inside and taking their weapons; then and only then did they accept retiring to safer areas.

Within the next few weeks the Kor "incident" was repeated several times throughout South Vietnam. Without previous consultation, the Vietnamese peasant masses, including the tribes considered to be the most undeveloped, successively violated both the "line" and the Geneva Agreements, took up arms in response to the repression by the government, and spontaneously started the guerrilla war.

"We had made every effort to follow the line, and many thought that we should keep to the rules of a strictly legal fight. But we could do nothing to stop what the people themselves had spontaneusly started," the communist cadre told Burchett. The tribesmen, the most undeveloped of peasants, swept the cadres and the leaders into the most advanced armed confrontation waged by humanity at this moment: the guerrilla warfare in Vietnam.

Since the beginning, the war in Vietnam has been a war of the masses, a new war, a consolidation and an expansion of the experience of the Chinese people's great revolutionary war which had triumphed ten years before.

The greatest achievement of Burchett's report, *Vietnam: Inside Story of the Guerrilla War,** is that it demonstrates the extent of the multiple, constant, and always present intervention of the Vietnamese masses in the war. And the masses means everybody: as in the case of Pho Muc Gia, Burchett gives us countless examples showing that in decisive moments the initiative did not come from the men, but from the women, the children, or the aged. All, even the bees in the beehives thrown by the guerrillas against the enemy, all moved to defeat the dictatorship and to expel the imperialist army.

Besides, it is clearly stated in the report that the war in Vietnam never ceased entirely; that in 1954 the whole of Vietnam was controlled by the revolutionary forces and that imperialism was defeated; and that the Geneva Agreements, for the sake of a so-called "peaceful coexistence"—which never existed in-

* Published by International Publishers, New York, 1965. Reviewed in MR, May, 1965.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side Vietnam—imposed upon the Vietnamese people an unnecessary retreat and countless and useless losses and sufferings after the war had been won.

The Chiefs of Staff of the capitalist armies can study this book. They can draw up lists of all the "secret" weapons invented by the Vietnamese: poisoned arrows, rifles that fire anything that looks like a bullet, rifles with triggers controlled by rubber bands, and cannons made with pieces of airplanes or cars; catapults that throw stones which are "as big as buffaloes"; incendiary arrows filled with sulphur; ropes with prongs that trap the invader's legs in brooks and rice fields; sticks with prongs for traps; and even a terrible basket filled with compact clay, weighing up to 300 pounds and bristling with bamboo spears which hangs by a rope from a tree and is dropped on an enemy column, destroying its men. When they have finished the list, it will be obsolete; for the Vietnamese will already have invented new weapons that do not exist in the technical manuals and will have placed them where nobody, except the peasant masses, could imagine or foresee.

The quicksand that swallowed the South Vietnamese army and that is swallowing the American army is the initiative and the creative capacity of these masses put to service in a war which constitutes their daily way of life, their way of asserting themselves as human beings. It is their only but sure way to unconquerability: "the important factor is neither numerical force nor weapons, but morale and determination," says another Vietcong cadre. And the latter, we must add, are not abstract moral conditions, but qualities possible only when people are fighting for their right to command their own destiny and establish their own power.

These qualities are not confined to Vietnam. Even though the Guatemalan guerrilla movement has not developed into a war of the masses, it does have within its territory all the elements that bring it close to the Vietnamese way: the peasant committees, the combination of political and military struggle, the essentially political character of the military action, the armed propaganda, the peasant militias, the combination of urban struggle with the peasant guerrilla. And there is a similarity in the material means of guerrilla life: the hammocks, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nylon, the footwear, the camps, the ambushes, the daily food rations. Above all, there are similarities in the political forms: the political discussions among the guerrillas, the submission of guerrilla activity to the partisan leadership, and even the initial newspapers—handwritten on notebook paper by the guerrillas themselves—carrying to the peasants the news about clashes and the plans for future action.

In the same way the initiatives from below are similar and yet infinitely varied, beginning with the incessant work of the peasantry, including the women, upon the enemy soldiers, work that demoralizes and divides the army's forces.

It is not, however, consultation that has determined these similarities at different levels of the struggle from Asia to Latin America. What distinguishes all guerrilla action in the process of development today from past guerrilla experiences is the organized incorporation of the masses into the struggle, which thereby becomes a war of the masses. And the complete intervention of the masses in the struggle not only determines its forms and methods, but also ends up by determining its goals, whatever the intention of the leadership. There is a contrast in Burchett's book between the extraordinary audacity and inventiveness of the militants and lower cadres on the one side and the timid and compromising statements of the leadership on the other. Although Burchett does not draw political conclusions from this contrast, it is still very interesting. Either the timid and negotiating program of the leadership limits the initiative of the base and circumscribes the battle; or the audacity from below not only has its impact on the enemy, but ends up by overcoming the leadership's limitations.

When the war started, the initiative from below was the deciding factor. Even though the author does not say it, the whole structure of this remarkable report shows that, once more, the initiative of the masses has imposed its own character on the war, has won over the cadres, has imposed upon them its own goals, and in that sense has prevailed over the limited program expounded by the leadership.

In sum, in keeping with what happened in the first national liberation war which culminated with the establishment of the workers' state in North Vietnam, the masses have imposed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the war in South Vietnam a socialist character. This war is a socialist revolution whose name is not mentioned by the leadership but whose contents and forms are imposed by the masses from below.

While the resources of the imperialist army are based upon technique and industrial and military superiority, the Vietcong's resources are based on the masses' initiative, on their inventiveness, on their spirit of sacrifice and struggle. Thence comes everything, including, inevitably, the program. For to be based on the masses means to be based on their political understanding. The greater is the guerrilla's or the peasant's understanding, the greater is his audacity and the greater are his unexpected resources. Political understanding demands political life, collective discussion. Discussion means decision. And to decide is to begin governing, as the committees in the liberated zones are already doing, backed by the arms of the guerrillas and the militias. This is socialist revolution, and these facts determine, no matter what any leader may say, what is and what will be the character of the state that is being forged in this war.

If the fact that the leadership does not say this constitutes a retarding element, the fact that the masses impose it by their own collective decision—a decision which is unwritten and theorically simple, but asserted by the stubbornness of their deeds—constitutes an element of enormous clarity about the future of the world revolution.

This means that while theories about the stability of peaceful coexistence are being developed in Moscow—once the capital of revolution—it is in the jungles of Vietnam that a program for revolution is being worked out by methods accessible even to the most undeveloped masses.

Compared with Kosygin's speeches, this program may seem as primitive as an incendiary arrow is compared to napalm. But on both the political and the military levels the theoretical and practical weapons of the masses are determining the future; these weapons are the most "advanced" and they are deciding and triumphing over the theorists of peaceful coexistence and the practitioners of imperialist war.

This is possible because humanity has risen in rebellion, because the peasant revolutionary war has begun in some coun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries and is ready to spring up in new places, and because that war has an objective center that actually gives it a program: the existence of a whole system of workers' states which represent for the masses of the world the concrete and material program of the socialist revolution. The leadership of those states cannot abolish the fact on which they are themselves based—that they too represent workers' states—although for the sake of negotiation on coexistence they may choose to conceal it. The essentially practical masses choose to face this fact, and they act accordingly.

The war in Vietnam is possible only because the world revolution backs it. The socialist countries are part of this revolutionary force. Not simply because of whatever weapons and military technicians they may send, but above all because of their very existence, their opposition to the capitalist system, their objective role as the proletarian center of revolution. This center magnetically attracts the scattered peasant insurrections and tends both to eliminate their isolation and to elevate their program to the level of socialism. To understand this objective fact, regardless of the will or the statements of any leadership, is to understand the essentially socialist character of the wars of the masses in our time and the proletarian character of the revolutionary process in countries where the proletariat itself is infinitesimal, countries that in previous times would have exhausted themselves in tribal struggles without program or center.

Burchett registers one of the most extraordinary examples of both this force of attraction and the duality of power which the Geneva Agreements—fashioned by the most powerful states in the world—could never uproot from Vietnam:

> The Diem regime was never able to establish its rule over most of the region of Kontum, and in the areas ruled by the underground life went on as if the Diemist regime of Saigon did not even exist. "For instance," said Chi Bar, "in my village, Nong Con, north of the city of Kontum, we decided to imitate North Vietnam and to implement economic planning. Everybody greatly admired 'Uncle Ho' and when we found out through radio Hanoi what was being done up there, the whole village—especially the young—expressed the desire to follow the same path."

Unbelievable as it may seem, while Diem's military and police swept the rest of the country, an experiment in socialist economic planning was carried out in what was hitherto con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidered as one of the country's most underdeveloped regions. The Sedang minority, one of the most numerous groups, emerged from Stone Age society only one generation ago.

While the "Marxist" professors determine whether a country is "ripe" or not for socialist revolution, and while the high command gives assurances that the revolution is "national democratic" because they consider that the socialist revolution "is an adventure," the tribesmen of Kontum leap from the Stone Age to a planned collective economy! Not because they read the professors' books or paid attention to the advice of the "teachers," but because they heard what radio Hanoi said about North Vietnam and decided that it was good. It is the same process by which the Kor tribe arrived at the decision to take up arms while the "line" called for passive defense.

This is possible and it can triumph because humanity lives in a unique epoch of history, an epoch when it can finally take its destiny in its own hands. Not one or another leading class, but humanity, the "wretched of the earth," hundreds of millions of peasants are incorporated into life and revolution as they take up arms to conquer not only bread and land but also, and above all, human dignity. In this struggle the masses are preparing for socialism which will not be created by machines or worldly goods but by the conscience, the minds, and the hands of human beings. A primitive irreversible accumulation exists there already, a socialist accumulation that no bomb or army can destroy. Only in this context are the facts of this war of the masses possible. And these facts, hitherto extraordinary, are becoming increasingly common today from Vietnam to Guatemala.

If these things happen in Vietnam, it is not because Vietnam is an exception to the rule but because it is the place where today there rises to the surface that current which exists down deep in the masses of the world, just as in Guatemala there comes to life the program which is latent in the Latin American revolution. This is nothing less than world revolution. Because, in reality, humanity is intuitively developing the adequate means to answer and defeat capitalism's destructive technical development.

The war in Vietnam today demonstrates that in the future atomic power will fail. The American invading army is based

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon an overwhelming military and industrial technique and on the imperialist state apparatus. Atomic war can destroy all that and bring about chaos in a few hours. The Vietnamese guerrillas depend on the infinite presence, initiative, and activity of the masses. Atomic war can inflict great losses on them, but these losses would not compare with the paralysis which would strike the state and military machinery. Atomic war cannot stop the masses—with their already accumulated experience—from reorganizing with the same primitive means with which they now conduct the war, and from re-establishing all that needs re-establishment.

For to the immense technical development achieved by capitalism—which in its present agony is centered on destruction—humanity has succeeded in opposing a vast, unprecedented, collective participation in life, an indestructible primitive accumulation of socialist consciousness—what may be called human dignity—which no technical resource can destroy.

War is not finally decided by technical means, but by social means. As one of the Vietnamese leaders says: "Battles are not won by bombs and artillery; only infantry can occupy territories. And in that sense, the imperialists are in a blind alley. Is it possible to occupy a world in arms from Santo Domingo to Vietnam?" And he adds: "What counts above all is morale; the human factor is decisive. Given the enormous disproportion, if only material forces were important, we would have long ago been wiped out." While the Vietcong leader was telling Burchett this in January, 1965, an MR13 guerrilla leader told another journalist in Guatemala: "Our revolution draws its strength not only from Guatemala, but from the entire world. If it were merely a matter of our own forces, we would have been crushed already. Vietnam would also have been crushed." These coincidences without previous discussion and without a common program are the harbingers of a more decisive fact: the profound coincidence in methods, goals, and the masses' revolutionary way of life from one end of the world revolution to the other.

This fact will be reflected soon at the level of leaders and programs. Leaders and programs, always behind the masses in every revolutionary epoch, are progressively influenced by them

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the climax of the revolution approaches. And that revolution exists and is only conceivable now on a world scale. Vietnam shows how the factors from below accumulate for the reconstruction of the leadership of world revolution as it was conceived in Lenin's time.

In that process of reconstruction, the violence of the rising of the revolutionary tide in "underdeveloped" countries is possible only because in the "advanced" countries—in both capitalist and workers' states—under the apparent firmness of the status quo of coexistence, lies hidden a deep internal unrest. This unrest cannot be seen on the surface because of the heaviness of the overlying structures fabricated during tens of years. But if anything is characteristic of this epoch it is the unity of humanity and not its division or dispersion. Vietnam is possible because, whether in the advanced capitalist countries or in the Soviet Union, the masses experience internally the same life and the same influence from world revolution, regardless of whatever those on the scene say or do. The historical experience of the revolution shows that, when the situation ripens, the actors who usurp the main roles disappear through the trap door of the stage in the middle of their most theatrical gestures.

The dialectic of history tends to break through in search of a harmonious resolution. The most complete harmony is established in the culminating stage of the revolution. The war in Vietnam tells us what to expect: just as the tribesmen leaped from the Stone Age to socialist planning, so the proletarian masses of the capitalist and workers' states will leap forward with the same speed (surprising only to those who see only the externals), leaving behind the Reuthers, the Wilsons, the Thorezes, and the Brezhnevs and embracing programs and directives which will harmonize their lives and goals with the life and revolutionary goals which Vietnam symbolizes today.

Even Premier Ky told this reporter today that the Communists were closer to the people's yearnings for social justice and an independent life than his own government.

—James Reston, *New York Times,* Sept. 1, 1965.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

"Amerika Uber Alles"

"Amerika über Alles" was the title of the first-page leading article of the Paris daily *Le Monde* on October 8, 1965. The subject of the article was the revamping of West German foreign policy.

Public statements which Prime Minister Erhard and Foreign Minister Schroeder have made recently clearly indicate the new course which German foreign policy will take in the transition period immediately ahead.

During the early postwar years, a defeated, devastated West Germany submitted to foreign military occupation, gladly accepted aid from Washington, and permitted United States capital to play a vital role in the rehabilitation of the German economy. The consequence has been immediately beneficial to the West German economy. In two decades the country has risen from the ashes of defeat to become the third nation of the world in industrial production and the second in international trade.

France has played a significant role in this development. In one sense France was a victim of the 1939-1945 war. It was defeated, occupied, and exploited by the Nazis. Under De Gaulle's leadership, the country turned to its erstwhile enemy (Germany) for an alliance aimed at making France the continental mainstay of the West. This De Gaulle policy involved belittling and excluding Britain from the continental Common Market and baiting and by-passing the United States, whose foreign policy since 1945 has centered around the Cold War. The primary aim of United States policy has been a united western and central Europe strong enough to stand up against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible Soviet intervention, but so weak as to require continued occupation by United States armed forces.

Behind this Atlantic Alliance defense screen, West Germany has risen quickly and decisively to be continental Europe's second power, clipping the wings of Gaullist ambition, bypassing Britain, and prepared to stand side by side with the United States as the co-arbiter of Western destiny. The second Erhard cabinet is being organized to represent and interpret this developing status of postwar Germany as the major European force unfolding and directing Western policy.

In the face of violent opposition from former Premier Adenauer, Mr. Schroeder is pursuing a policy of "closeness" to the United States, writes *Le Monde*. In an interview for the *Rheinische Post* entitled, "Nothing Doing Without the United States," quoted by *Le Monde,* the Foreign Minister says: "A European policy presupposes a close collaboration with the United States. . . . The supreme objective of German policy is that of the United States." *Le Monde* comments: "Only American protection will enable the West Germans to move toward the power position which they covet. . . . Hence the *Amerika über Alles* couplet which Mr. Schroeder is beginning to sing."

For the moment, *Deutschland über Alles* is an unrealizable and therefore an impolitic slogan. *Amerika über Alles,* on the other hand, places Germany in a position from which it may one day arbitrate, at the very least, the destinies of Europe. For the moment, therefore, Germany is content to play the Number Two role in directing the destinies of Europe. Later on, it may aspire once more to first place in the determination of human affairs.

Uncle Sam's Self-Portrait

Self-portraits are likely to be askew, partly because the portrayer lacks perspective, but mostly because the pressures of self-interest usually jog the artist's elbow.

Informations et Documents, the bi-monthly magazine published in French by the Center of American Culture in Paris, on October 1, 1965, featured an article headed "Why Vietnam?" Responsibility for the article rests, of course, with the State Department. The first paragraph sketches in the background.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"American reinforcements are spread south of the 17th parallel where the Vietcong carry on their guerrilla operations, aided in certain sectors by regular units of the North Vietnam army. To the north of this frontier, the supply lines of the rebels and military objectives in territory controlled by the Hanoi government are objects of continuous aerial bombardment. Men die every day in the Vietnamese rice paddies, villages are destroyed, innocents massacred."

This grim survey of a people who have been at war almost continuously for the past twenty years presents the point of view of an outsider—from halfway around the earth. It does not explain why the Vietnamese are in the war. Vietnam is a narrow strip of land (some of it very fertile) stretching along the eastern Asian seaboard. For at least a thousand years the Vietnamese have been trying to enforce the rule, "Vietnam for the Vietnamese." In recent years their chief adversaries have been: first France; then Japan; and, since 1954, the United States. In each of these cases the Vietnamese have been trying to prevent a foreign power from taking over their country. That is the chief reason why Vietnamese, North and South, are fighting today.

State Department propaganda overlooks this plain fact. Consequently it is persistently out of focus. State Department policy is not concerned with Vietnam but with the United States and its interests. Vietnam, at the moment, is one of the leading United States foreign interests.

Why is the United States in Vietnam? Because, writes the representative of the American Cultural Center, Communist policy-makers "have decided that the Saigon government must disappear and that South Vietnam should, for good or ill, join the Communist states."

This argument might be impressive were it not for the fact that a decade ago, before 1954, when Vietnam was arbitrarily (and temporarily) divided at the 17th parallel, the Vietnamese were triumphantly concluding a ten-year war of independence directed against the French occupiers of Indo-China, including Vietnam. At that point communism was not an issue. The Vietnamese were winning a war of liberation from imperial vassalage to France.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eleven years later, these same Vietnamese people are engaged in a continuation of the liberation war against a new occupying power, the United States, which has taken over where the French left off. Vietnamese have been warring against this United States occupying power for the past decade. They are still warring in 1965.

The American Cultural Center article quotes President Johnson as saying in April 1965 that Washington (which now has an army of 165,000 occupying Vietnam) is ready at any time to negotiate without any prior conditions. But there *is* one condition, the occupation of Vietnam by foreign armies, navies, and air forces, which is already an accomplished fact. There is another condition. President Johnson says he will deal only with governments, and Washington does not recognize the National Liberation Front (which controls most of the territory in South Vietnam and has the support of most of its people) as a government. With the exception of these two preconditions, Washington is ready to negotiate "without preconditions."

This kind of double-talk fools no one, not even the leading United States policy-maker, President Johnson. The President himself has said that the United States is in Vietnam to prevent the further extension of communism, and that no power on earth can get the United States out of Vietnam until this purpose is accomplished.

But why talk nonsense? Why not get down to brass tacks? The United States fought from 1898 to 1902 for the right to military occupation of the Philippines. It fought from 1941 to 1945 to militarily occupy Japan. It fought from 1950 to 1953 to occupy South Korea. It has been maneuvering and fighting since before 1954 to occupy Southeast Asia. United States armed forces—land, sea, and air—now occupy the entire Pacific area. For the past decade they have been maneuvering and fighting to extend that control to the Asian mainland. Let's call a spade a spade. Vietnam is one step along the path to the Western reconquest of Asia.

A Problem with a Long History

In order to get perspective on the Vietnam issue I would like to quote some passages from an editorial that appeared on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

October 9, 1965, in *Le Populaire du Centre,* a French Socialist paper:

The Vietnam trap in which the Americans find themselves without really knowing how to get out, is an issue which started far back and for which Washington carries a good part of the responsibility.

President Roosevelt was not particularly fond of France, no more than he was of Stalin and infinitely less than of Churchill. She did not appeal either to his puritanism or to the naive ideology which the Soviet dictator knew so well how to profit by in order to gain advantages detrimental to the West. On the subject of Indo-China, Roosevelt's opinion (frequently expressed during conferences with his staff of diplomatic and military advisers) was something like this: "France has done practically nothing in this area. In particular, she has brought no solution for the problem of poverty. There is no reason to maintain her presence there."

This presence was maintained nonetheless, with more or less success. . . . But this stern judgment (which was not entirely false) continued to guide American diplomacy after the death of Roosevelt.

Certainly our reverses in Indo-China were received across the Atlantic without serious emotion, and even with a kind of unexpressed satisfaction. They thought in Washington that France was no longer capable of maintaining itself in Tonkin (which was true) but that after going through this ordeal, dollar politics would succeed where we had failed. This last proposition was not entirely true. It belonged to that package of tenacious illusions of which United States history offers so many examples.

Nevertheless it is on this illusion that the United States has become entangled in South Vietnam. To any sensible mind it is clear that the 17th parallel line of demarcation is wholly artificial and incapable of separating two regimes as different as communism à la China, and a neo-capitalism supported by foreign influence. It is equally clear that no common national sentiment unites the population, the regions, and the communities theoretically under Saigon control. A new regime politically anarchic, torn between the military and between religious sects, adds further to a confusion which neither military power nor American economic aid has succeeded in dissipating to the slightest degree.

If we've got one thing missing in Vietnam, it's motivation.
—Barry Zorthian, USIS Director in Saigon, quoted by the *Washington Post,* May 16, 1965.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF SILENCE

BY KEITH BUCHANAN

Le Vietnam entre deux paix, by Jean Lacouture, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1965.
Dans les maquis "vietcong," by Madeleine Riffaud, Julliard, Paris, 1965.

In the New Zealand press, probably in the British press, certainly in the BBC's news bulletins, the Vietnamese conflict is, at the present moment (mid-October), either sedulously ignored or dismissed in a few brief words. The full extent of this conspiracy of silence becomes apparent only if one follows the French press: thus the issue of *Le Monde* of October 10-11 comments that "defoliation missions have become an almost daily event around the An-Khe base. . . . Some months ago a vast defoliating operation was carried out to the east of Saigon to cut the country in two"; the same issue adds that "on Wednesday 172 fighter-bombers carried out a total of 42 attacks on North Vietnam. This is the highest number of attacks recorded since the beginning of the raids on February 2." The character of the Vietnamese war, the mounting campaign of terror designed to bring the Vietnamese people to their knees, the increasingly sophisticated barbarisms employed (fragmentation bombs, chemicals, gas, and new types of dum-dum bullets), all these are carefully hidden from us behind a curtain of silence.

Under such circumstances the work of French reporters becomes of critical importance, for it provides a vital insight into the day-to-day evolution of this Second Indo-Chinese War and also into its political and sociological roots. And such work is important for two other reasons: first, because it sweeps aside the tissue of hypocrisies and half-truths with which the American power élite and its collaborators have concealed the truth about Vietnam; second, because it presents us with the

Keith Buchanan, a frequent contributor to MR, is a professor of geography at Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

views not only of the Saigon junta and its American backers but also of the leaders of the National Liberation Front, and, in the case of a volume such as Madeleine Riffaud's, of the rank and file of the Liberation forces.

The two volumes here reviewed are outstanding in this field and are complementary. Jean Lacouture is correspondent for *Le Monde,* and his work has the meticulous accuracy and balanced objectivity for which his newspaper is distinguished; Madeleine Riffaud is a correspondent for the left-wing *L'Humanité,* is more committed in the war she is reporting and, as a woman—and a woman of great courage and sensitivity—is more involved with the human dimensions of the struggle, with the sufferings and the achievements of an armed people confronting the most advanced and most ruthless military power of our time.

In his introduction to Lacouture's study, Philippe Devillers puts the Vietnamese war in its geopolitical context: for twenty years Vietnam has been one of the major zones of confrontation between the Atlantic (or capitalist) world and the socialist world; he also sets the present war firmly in its historical context, observing that for the United States the Geneva Agreement was not a peace but merely a means of gaining the time necessary to build up an anti-communist defensive system in Asia. And the beginnings of the present conflict go back to 1958 when the Diem regime was using troops at divisional strength and backed by American "advisors" to break the back of a peasant revolt. The Vietnamese New Year of 1959 marks the beginning of the war of "legitimate defense" against the repression of the Diem regime. In the closing paragraphs of his introduction, Devillers, speaking with the authority of one of France's leading experts on Southeast Asia, comments that China can no more tolerate an "Americanization" of Indo-China than the United States can tolerate the area's "Sinicization"; what is essential is an *independent* Vietnam, and this is possible only if the United States and its allies recognize the reality that "the forces of the Left in South Vietnam are too long-established and too strong to be suppressed by any international agreement" (p. 19), and that a final settlement which would make possible an independent South is dependent on the suppression of all foreign bases, the withdrawal of United States forces, and the possibility for the South Vietnamese to choose a neutrality "which it is for them to define." Such conditions, in the judgment of an expert who is usually regarded as both Catholic and anti-communist, are the *minimum* terms on which a real settlement might be based.

Jean Lacouture's analysis, based in part on an expansion of his on-the-spot reporting for his newspaper, bears out this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion. Five years (1954-1959) of correct observance of the Geneva Agreement by the North led nowhere, he points out; meanwhile, the South Vietnamese, having seen the promised 1956 elections passed over and suffering increasingly from the repression of the Diem government, became increasingly critical of the passivity of Hanoi. It was this Southern pressure which brought about the decision of the Third Congress of the Lao Dong Party (1960) to throw its weight behind the revolutionary struggle of their fellow countrymen in the South to break the hold of Diem and his American backers. By mid-January, 1962, the PPR (Peoples Revolutionary Party), an openly Marxist party, emerged in the South, to form a radical wing of the NLF. To assume that this was inspired solely by Hanoi is, as Lacouture underlines, to overlook the fact that in the South the communists had had at least 25 years in which to build up their organization. And, as the First Congress of the Liberation Front showed two months later, while the objectives of the Front in the social and economic fields were clearly revolutionary, in the political field the emphasis was strongly on neutrality and independence for the South. This same emphasis was reiterated in July, 1962, with the call for a neutral zone to embrace South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; here was a "Southern" policy whose independence of the North was further emphasized by the calls for a broad alliance of all religious, social, and political groups in the struggle for freedom.

The general picture which emerges is of an increasingly integrated revolutionary struggle against the Diem regime, a struggle essentially grass-roots and Southern in its leadership and objectives and one which had, as one of its components, a strong drive for neutralization of the region. And when Diem was eliminated in November 1963 (the role of the U.S. in this affair is examined in some detail by Lacouture, pp. 96-101) the very success of his American-supported policy of repression meant that there remained no coherent groups or organizations on which the United States might base its policy of creating an anti-communist bastion. The result has been an uneasy succession of puppet regimes; the fiction of American "aid" has worn thin, and the war shows its true face as an American war, fought increasingly by American troops.

Perhaps the most revealing —and alarming—sections of the volume are those in which Lacouture examines the changing pattern of American intervention and the psychological attitudes associated with this change. Confronted with their inability to fight the Liberation Front to a standstill in what the author terms the "war of the knife in the rice field," a solution is sought by extending the war beyond the 17th parallel and by creating conditions in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which America's technological superiority will weigh more heavily ("a strange strategy which, in order to kill a snake whose head cannot be crushed, paints its tail red in order to cut it off," p. 251). The new pattern is put forward by those with whom Lacouture spoke with "a scarcely-contained tone of violence" which reminded him of the military hysteria during the Suez crisis. And in the carrying out of this new and expanded war the United States is prepared to flout world opinion, arrogating to itself the right to strike where and when it pleases. This new phase was initiated by the massive air attacks of March 2, 1965 (the first attacks which were not ostensibly "reprisals"); the new contempt for world opinion was driven home by the use of "non-lethal" gases which began on March 22nd. A decade or more of broken agreements, of evasions and lies, of condoned torture and repression, and of mounting Western brutality now approaches a climax in which the most powerful military machine in history is unleashed to break the will of a peasant people.

It is at this point that Madeleine Riffaud's volume is of such critical importance, for in her pages we can begin to understand those human elements in the situation which have given the Vietnamese their almost incredible powers of survival in the face of a massed weaponry, a daily pounding with napalm, phosphorus, and fragmentation bombs, which exceeds the greatest efforts of the Nazis in the Second World War. She writes from experience, having spent several weeks with the Liberation Army, sharing the risks the bombing, the *ratissages,* and the small joys of those among whom she moved. More than any other volume this reviewer has read, hers captures the epic quality of a struggle in which "bamboo is pitted against steel." It is a struggle in which humanity and savagery are juxtaposed—and the savagery is not that of the jungle but of twentieth-century Western man, the irresponsible savagery of those for whom everything that moves is a potential "Vietcong" to be eliminated, whose reprisals against those who resist recall the savage yet calculated brutality of Hitler's armies when confronted by the resistance fighters of Europe.

This is the savagery which swells the ranks of the Liberation Front's forces: "In one regiment 69 percent had lost a close relative through reprisals or bombing. Eleven percent had lost their mothers, 12 percent their fathers through torture or beheading between 1954 and 1960. . . . It is this that makes the soldiers say, 'It is the Americans who created our regiment.'" The picture Mlle. Riffaud gives us is of an army whose average age is 20 years, an army belonging to a generation that has never known peace, whose childhood and adolescence were shadowed by the torturing or killing of rela-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives, a generation inspired with hatred for those who, as one married girl puts it, "have stolen our country and, in addition, and all this time, the best years of our life, when we were young, when we could have been happy together." It is these things, and not "Vietcong terrorism," that swell the ranks of the Liberation Army, and it is these things that underline the truth that counter-revolutionary terror solves nothing. And from Mlle. Riffaud's account the lineaments of the basic conflict of our time emerge clearly: this is the conflict between the vision of man as a full human being, with an inalienable dignity, a need for, and a great capacity for, both love and idealism; and the vision which sees man as something to be manipulated—and if necessary broken—by money or by machines, a vision which spreads like a miasma in our affluent societies and which is tacitly accepted even by those who speak out most loudly against it. Mlle. Riffaud's volume comes as a welcome affirmation of the rightness of this first vision and is a tribute to all those who, in the fire-scarred jungles and bomb-pitted paddy fields of Vietnam, are upholding the cause of humanity in an increasingly dehumanized century.

MR PRESS

PAPERBACKS

Explosion over Latin America: The Man at the Door with the Gun by Cedric Belfrage	$ 2.75
The American Revolution by James Boggs	1.00
Capitalism Yesterday And Today by Maurice Dobb	1.00
Whither Latin America? by Carlos Fuentes and Others	1.75
Man's Worldly Goods by Leo Huberman	2.95
Cuba: Anatomy Of A Revolution by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy	1.75
The Accumulation Of Capital by Rosa Luxemburg	3.95
Parliamentary Socialism by Ralph Miliband	3.45
The Socialist Register, 1965 Ralph Miliband and John Saville, Editors	3.45
World Crisis in Oil by Harvey O'Connor	3.95
The Alienation Of Modern Man by Fritz Pappenheim	2.45
The Ordeal Of British Guiana by Philip Reno	1.45
Notes From China by Joan Robinson	.75
The Present As History by Paul M. Sweezy	2.95
Review 1 by Weisinger and others	1.00
TOTAL	**$34.60**

PAPERBACK SPECIAL

All the above books **$25.00**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(continued from inside front cover)

We have just changed our system of handling the subscription list to one which we are confident will be both more economical and more efficient. However, as was probably inevitable during such a change-over, a certain number of errors and slips occurred, as a result of which some subscribers will have received their copies of the November issue late. We apologize and ask your indulgence.

While we are on the subject of subs, let us point out that it may take up to a month for a sub to become effective (depending on when during the month it is received), and that in the meantime a renewal notice may have been sent out. If you receive such a notice after you have sent in your renewal, just ignore it.

Finally in this connection, a word to Associates. Expiration notices will no longer be mailed from our office to members of the Associates, as they have been in the past, but will be sent by the mailer along with notices to regular subscribers. So if you receive an expiration notice after you have sent in your contribution to the Associates, please don't let it bother you. Membership in the Associates does carry an automatic sub renewal, and yours will be taken care of. All that has happened is that your check and the expiration notice crossed in the mails.

A member of the Associates writes to ask whether he can buy any number of books at half list price, or only single copies. The answer is: any number of any titles. This Associate plans to take advantage of this discount to send out a large number of gifts, an excellent idea which we warmly recommend to other Associates.

MR PRESS

Prepublication Bargains

MONOPOLY CAPITAL
by Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy
List price: $ 8.75 Prepublication price: $6.00

MAU-MAU FROM WITHIN
by Donald Barnett and Karari Njama
List price: $10.00 Prepublication price: $7.00

LANDS ALIVE (TERRES VIVANTES)
by René Dumont
List price: $ 6.75 Prepublication price: $4.50

THE ROAD TO SPAIN
by Ira Morris
List price: $ 4.95 Prepublication price: $3.50

Order now AND SAVE

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three Christmas Gifts
for less than the price of one

You send a gift sub to a friend for $5 (foreign $6)

and

We will send, free, to another friend:

A copy of Review I

Monthly Review Supplement 1965

and

To still another friend:

A copy of our July-August issue, by Anne Braden, on "The Southern Freedom Movement In Perspective"

We will enclose gift cards signed as you direct.

Remember: every gift sub you send to a friend is, at the same time, a gift to MR.

And remember, too, that these special rates apply only to NEW SUBS, not to renewals.

●

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Avenue New York 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED